

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested on the basis of the following particulars.

1. In the specification

A substitute specification is provided to correct informalities and to place the specification in conformance with U.S. practice. No new matter is added, as the changes simply correct minor informalities.

Entry of the substitute specification is respectfully requested in the next Office communication.

2. In the drawings

In response to the drawing objections in the last Office communication, the specification has been amended, as shown in the substitute specification filed herewith. The specification now refers only to opening 18 and holder 111, and therefore only a single element is referenced by each reference numeral. Accordingly, removal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

3. In the claims

As shown in the foregoing AMENDMENT TO THE CLAIMS, the claims have been amended to more clearly point out the subject matter for which protection is sought.

A. Claims 1-13

Claims 1-13 are amended to clarify and overcome the numerous rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The amendments are made to merely clarify and correct minor informalities. No new matter is added since support for the changes is clearly found at least in the drawings and specification as originally filed.

Specific attention is drawn to the clarification in claim 6 and in the specification describing how the hook bit 311 blocks the primary nozzle from being extended by overlapping a flange-like portion 23 of the primary nozzle. These

features can clearly be seen in Figs. 7 and 8, where the hook bit 311 is shown to overlap the edge 23 of the primary nozzle in Fig. 8, and where the hook bit 311 is shown in an extended position and not overlapping the edge 23 of the primary nozzle in Fig. 7.

Also, specific attention is drawn to the clarification and rewording of the “grain” in claim 10 and the specification. The word grain has been replaced with stop or nub, and this feature can be clearly seen at reference numeral 22 in Figs. 1, 5, 18 and 19.

B. Claims 14-23

Claims 14-23 are amended to clarify and overcome the numerous rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Additionally, claim 14 is amended to recite the structure indicated as allowable in the last Office communication. The remaining amendments are made to merely clarify and correct minor informalities. No new matter is added since support for the changes is clearly found at least in the drawings and specification as originally filed.

C. Claim 24

Claim 24 is amended to clarify and overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The amendments are made to merely clarify and correct minor informalities. No new matter is added since support for the changes is clearly found at least in the drawings and specification as originally filed.

Entry of the AMENDMENT TO THE CLAIMS is respectfully requested in the next Office communication.

4 Rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Korean document KR20-0181859 (the Korean document)

Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested, in view of the amendment to claim 14, on the basis that the Korean document fails to disclose each and every limitation of claim 14.

The Korean document does not disclose a vacuum cleaner having a dust receiver having an inner sleeve, wherein a built-in hose is compressed and stored within the inner sleeve, as required by amended claim 14.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

5. Allowable subject matter

The applicant appreciates the attention to detail provided in the last Office communication, and gratefully acknowledges the indication of allowable subject matter in original claims 1-13, and 15-24. Accordingly, the applicant has amended claims 1-24 to clarify and overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejections. Applicant has also amended claim 14 to include the structure of a dust receiver having an inner sleeve, wherein a built-in hose is compressed and stored within the inner sleeve, which was indicated as allowable in the last Office communication.

6. Conclusion

As a result of the amendment to the claims, and further in view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that every pending claim in the present application be allowed and the application be passed to issue.

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the applicants' attorney, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown below.

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC  
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176  
Phone: (703) 683-0500  
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080

Date: August 14, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



JUSTIN J. CASSELL  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 46,205